

Report of the Accreditation Re-visit to Notre Dame de Namur University March 22-24, 2010

Overview:

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visit to Notre Dame de Namur University that was conducted March 15-18, 2009. This item provides the report of the re-visit team and recommendations regarding four stipulations and the accreditation status.

Staff Recommendations

1. That the four stipulations from the 2009 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.

Background

A COA accreditation team conducted a visit at Notre Dame de Namur University on March 15-18, 2009. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for Notre Dame De Namur University and all of its credential programs: **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a re-visit within one year of the accreditation action. The institution prepared a document indicating how each of the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The re-visit was conducted by the original team leader, an Advanced/Services Cluster member and CTC staff consultant. The team completed a more focused study on the Administration program because this program had the most standards that were either met with concerns or not met. After the interviews on campus, the team prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action.

Following are the stipulations from the original accreditation visit and the Re-visit team's recommendations:

Stipulations from the 2009 Visit	Re-visit Team Recommendations
1. That the unit provide evidence of a unit assessment system and the use of data for program improvement.	Removal of stipulation.
2. That the unit provide evidence of institutional structures in place to assure that advising, program coordination, and faculty-student ratios are monitored and consistently implemented.	Removal of stipulation.
3. That the institution is required to provide evidence about actions taken to address all of the stipulations for the program standards that were either "met with concerns" or "not met" within one year of the date of this action.	Removal of stipulation
4. That a revisit by Commission staff, the accreditation team leader, and an additional team member focusing on the Preliminary Administrative Services program take place within one year	Removal of stipulation

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM RE-VISIT REPORT**

Institution: Notre Dame De Namur University

Dates of Re-Visit: March 22-24, 2010

**Original
COA Accreditation
Decision:** Accreditation with Stipulations

Re-visit Team Recommendations

The team recommends that:

1. That the four stipulations from the 2009 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations** to **Accreditation**

Rationale

Based upon the Institutional Response to the Stipulations, review of supporting evidence and interviews with faculty members, institutional administration, students and graduates, the team determined that the institution has provided responses to each of the stipulations and made substantial progress towards meeting the stipulations. In addition, the institution has addressed the standards less than fully met which were identified during the accreditation visit one year ago and the standards were all found to be met.

Team Leader: **Edmundo F. Litton**
Loyola Marymount University

Advanced /Services Team Cluster **Beverly B. Foster**
Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego

Staff: **Jan Jones Wadsworth, Consultant**

Following are the approved stipulations after the site visit in 2009 and followed by the 2009 institutional response. Next are listed the revisit team findings and recommendations. Last, the revisit team findings on the Common Standards and program standards are included.

Findings on Stipulations

Stipulation #1

That the unit provide evidence of a unit assessment system and the use of data for program improvement.

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution provided evidence related to **Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation** that was not fully met during the initial site visit.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

Through document review and interviews, the team confirmed that **Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation** has been met. See report pages 5-6.

Revisit Team Recommendation (2010)

Revisit team recommends removal of stipulation.

Stipulation #2

That the unit provide evidence of institutional structures in place to assure that advising, program coordination, and faculty-student ratios are monitored and consistently implemented.

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution provided evidence related to **Common Standard 3: Resources** that was not fully met during the initial site visit.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

Through document review and interviews, the team confirmed that **Common Standard 3: Resources** has been met. See report pages 6-7.

Revisit Team Recommendation (2010)

Revisit team recommends removal of stipulation.

Stipulation # 3

That the institution is required to provide evidence about actions taken to address all of the stipulations for the program standards that were either “met with concerns” or “not met” within one year of the date of this action.

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution provided evidence related to all program standards that were not fully met during the initial site visit.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

Through document review and interviews, the team confirmed that specific program standards for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Level 1 Education Specialist, Level 2 Education Specialist and Administrative Services that were **Not Met** or were **Met with Concerns** are now fully **Met**.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

Revisit team recommends removal of stipulation

Stipulation #4

That a focused revisit take place in one year, focusing on a) assessment of candidate competence in the multiple and single subject programs and education specialist credential programs and b) the three stipulations above.

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution prepared for, and hosted a revisit to Notre Dame De Namur University on March 22-24, 2010. In preparing for the revisit, institution representatives maintained regular contact with the CTC consultant in charge of the revisit from May 2009 through March 2010.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

A focused revisit was conducted during dates indicated above, and the team was able to gather all documentary and interview evidence needed to address all Common and Program Standards that were found less than fully met in the March 2009 site visit.

Revisit Team Recommendation (2010)

Revisit team recommends removal of stipulation.

Common Standards

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completion performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Findings on Common Standard 2 (2009)

Standard is Met with Concerns

Evidence of assessment included embedded signature assignments, grades, PACT, faculty feedback, student observations and evaluations. Interviews with staff, faculty and students indicate assessments are embedded throughout the programs. The unit continues to improve in implementing formal means of assessment. The unit collects student work, student evaluations, and other assessments. No evidence of data collection outcomes could be found for assessing ongoing program improvement and program evaluation.

Faculty syllabi, field evaluations, and PACT for multiple and single subject indicated assessments were implemented throughout the programs. The program handbooks support and inform the use of assessments throughout the educational preparation programs.

There was insufficient evidence to determine how data was analyzed for ongoing program improvement.

Institutional Response (2010)

Notre Dame De Namur University revised its response to Common Standard 2. The faculty and staff in the School of Education and Leadership used a May 2009 retreat to focus on issues regarding assessment. The May retreat is now an annual event. The Institution also provided the team with minutes of meetings that showed that faculty discussed data. Hence, program changes were made as a result of data. The revised response to Common Standard 2 showed how PACT scores were used for program improvement in the Multiple and Single Subject programs. A syllabus for a new capstone course in the Administration program was presented. This capstone course will serve as the summative evaluation tool for the Administration program. Furthermore, the team met with the Interim Provost and the President of the University. They described a university-wide assessment system. The School of Education and Leadership programs are evaluated in this university assessment system. The Chair of the Graduate Standards Committee met with a team member and shared minutes of a meeting that showed that program improvement was being made and had to be approved by the committee.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

Several ongoing assessment and evaluations are now in place for each of the programs. The Multiple Subject and Single Subject program uses data from the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) for program improvement. An examination of meeting minutes show that faculty discuss the PACT scores and have made program improvements as a result of the discussion. Programmatic changes were also made based on candidate evaluations.

Candidates in the Special Education program have assignments in coursework that are used for on-going assessments and evaluations. Candidates in the Administration program will be completing a year-long capstone course. In the May 2009 retreat, the faculty and administration discussed the systematic collection of data for program improvement and data from various programs were analyzed. All of the data from these various program assessments are discussed in a yearly School-wide retreat that is held in May of every year. Another retreat has been scheduled for May 2010. The School of Education and Leadership is on track to developing a robust assessment system.

After review of the documentation, interviews with faculty, administration, candidates, and graduates, the team finds that ***Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation*** is now **Met**.

STANDARD 3: RESOURCES

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Findings on Common Standard 3 (2009)

Standard is Met with Concerns

The chief financial officer (CFO) was interviewed and provided an overview of the unit budget that included personnel and academic resources. The academic resources included a library of books, electronic sources and research assistance. Student and faculty interviews revealed adequate resources such as advisement in admissions, credential progression, student teaching, the student learning center, remediation, tutorials for state exams, writing, San Mateo Resource Center and PACT. Students also acknowledged personnel resources such as faculty, PACT coordinator, program advisors, Task Stream/technology coordinator and a credential analyst as accessible resources.

Academic resources were allocated equally across all credential programs. Concerns were expressed about the ratio of full-time faculty to address program needs specifically in the area of Special Education. The team noted a need for an additional full-time faculty in Special Education.

Institutional Response (2010)

In preparing for the revisit, the Notre Dame de Namur University revised its response to Common Standard 3. The revised response showed that the University had allocated additional resources to the School of Education including a “scholar in residence”. Despite cuts in various parts of the University, the response to the standard stated that “The School of Education and Leadership have not been overly affected by these cuts”. The response also stated that the Chief Financial Officer at NDNU has conducted an extensive contribution analysis study in order to

allocate funds to programs that have a potential for growth. The School of Education and Leadership credential programs have been targeted for future growth.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

The Notre Dame de Namur University administration has made an effort to address the concern on the issue of adequate resources. A faculty position in Special Education was changed from 10-month position to a 12 –month position. The University also has a “scholar in residence” for the Special Education program. The School of Education and Leadership has just completed a request for a second faculty position in Special Education with a focus on the Moderate/Severe program. The Chief Financial Officer at NDNU has also designated the teaching credential and administration programs in the School of Education and Leadership as potential program for future growth. Thus additional resources have been allocated for these programs for the purpose of marketing, recruitment, and staff. A staff member in charge of enrollment management also works closely with the School of Education and Leadership to ensure that adequate resources are allocated to meet enrollment projections. The School of Education and Leadership now has two full time administrative assistants who can assist faculty and students. The School of Education and Leadership will also revitalize the scholarships for Catholic school educators.

After review of the documentation, interviews with faculty, administration, candidates, and graduates, the team finds that ***Standard 3: Resources*** is now **Met**.

Program Reports

Multiple Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards (2009)

One year ago, the team determined that two program standards were **Met with Concerns**:

Standard 2 Element (c) Collaboration in Governing the Program

While the Program informs partners about program policies and practices, the team found inconsistent evidence of partner collaboration in developing program policies and reviewing program practices pertaining to the recruitment, selection and advisement of candidates; development of curriculum; and delivery of instruction.

Standard 15: Element (c) Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork

The team did not find evidence that all candidates had significant experiences teaching English learners as a part of their student teaching experience, or in different settings, if necessary.

Institutional Response (2010)

The Institution was required to submit a document that shows how the concerns from the initial visit were addressed. The institution also provided minutes of meetings with the Advisory Council that showed that discussions were held with master teachers and principals of schools that have hosted student teachers. In these meetings, issues on recruitment and selection of candidates were discussed. Supervisors of the Multiple Subject candidates meet with each master teacher to discuss the curriculum of the program.

In the institutional response, NDNU described a system to monitor field experiences using a matrix that is monitored by a program director. This matrix ensures that candidates in student teaching or in an intern setting have exposure to diverse students throughout their field experiences.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

The team reviewed the documents that were provided. There are systems in place to ensure that the Institution is collaborating with relevant partners. Advisory Board meetings are held on a regular basis and University Supervisors interact with master teachers and other school based personnel. Faculty and staff in the program monitor all field experiences to ensure that candidates are in settings with English learners.

After review of the documentation and interview with administration and faculty, the team finds that the multiple subject program standards are now **Met**.

Single Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards (2009)

One year ago, the team determined that four program standards were **Met with Concerns**.

Standard 2: Element (c) Collaboration in Governing the Program

While the program informs partners about program policies and practices, the team found inconsistent evidence of partner collaboration in developing program policies and reviewing program practices pertaining to the recruitment, selection and advisement of candidates; development of curriculum; and delivery of instruction.

Standard 7B: Element (g) Single Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English

The team found inconsistent evidence of communication and collaboration among field site supervisors, student teaching supervisors, and the reading methods course instructor.

Standard 8B: Element (e-l) Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single-Subject (SS) Candidates

Element (e) The team found incomplete evidence regarding SS art, music, theatre, and dance candidates opportunities to learn, understand, and use specific teaching strategies and activities for achieving the fundamental goals of the *Visual and Performing Arts Framework and Student Academic Content Standards*.

Element (f) The team found incomplete evidence regarding SS physical education candidates opportunities to learn, understand and use content-specific teaching strategies for achieving the fundamental goals of the *Physical Education Framework*.

Element (g) The team found incomplete evidence regarding SS languages candidates opportunities to learn to teach the fundamental goals of the *Foreign Language Framework*.

Element (h) The team found incomplete evidence regarding SS health science candidates opportunities to learn to plan and implement instruction based on the *Health Framework for California Public Schools*.

Element (i) The team found incomplete evidence regarding SS agriculture candidates learn, understand and use content-specific teaching strategies and instructional planning approaches appropriate to the subject area.

Element (j) The team found incomplete evidence regarding SS business candidates learn, understand and use content-specific teaching strategies and instructional planning approaches appropriate to the subject area.

Element (k) The team found incomplete evidence regarding SS home economics candidates learn, understand and use content-specific teaching strategies and instructional planning approaches appropriate to the subject area.

Element (l) The team found incomplete evidence regarding SS industrial technology candidates learn, understand and use content-specific teaching strategies and instructional planning approaches appropriate to the subject area.

Standard 15: Element (c) Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork

The team found inconsistent evidence that all candidates had significant experiences teaching English learners as a part of their student teaching experience, or in a different setting, if necessary.

Institutional Response (2010)

The Institution was required to submit a document that shows how the concerns from the initial visit were addressed. The institution provided minutes of meetings with the Advisory Council that showed that discussions were held with master teachers and principals of schools that have hosted student teachers. In these meetings, issues on recruitment and selection of candidates were discussed. Supervisors of the Multiple Subject candidates meet with each master teacher to discuss the curriculum of the program.

In the institutional response, NDNU described a system to monitor field experiences using a matrix. This matrix ensures that candidates in student teaching or in an intern setting have exposure to diverse students throughout their field experiences.

The institution presented a plan for the instructor of the Content Area Reading course to collaborate with master teachers, principals, and field supervisors. This plan called for the instructor of the course to attend meetings of field supervisors.

Syllabi for content area methods classes were presented to the team. Secondary candidates take a course on methods that include general strategies for teaching in a single subject classroom. In addition to the class, candidates are assigned a content-specific mentor to coach and observe candidates. A revised response to the elements was also presented to the team. The response provided details on how candidates in Music, Art, Theatre, Physical Education, Health Education, and Foreign Language meet the requirements of this standard. The Dean of the School of Education and Leadership stated that they do not prepare candidates in the fields of agriculture, business, home economics, and industrial technology.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

The team reviewed the documents that were provided. There are systems in place to ensure that the Institution is collaborating with relevant partners. Advisory Board meetings are held on a regular basis and University Supervisors interact with master teachers and other school based personnel. Faculty and staff in the program monitor all field experiences to ensure that candidates are in settings with English learners. The revised response to the content specific standard were reviewed and were judged to have met the standard so that candidates in the single subject areas that were identified have the opportunity to learn the content-specific pedagogical

skills. After review of the documentation and interview with administration and faculty, the team finds that single subject program standards are now **Met**.

Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate/Moderate to Severe Level I

Findings on Standards (2009)

One year ago, the team determined that three program standards were **Met with Concerns**.

Standard 9: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination

Both the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe credential programs were designed in a developmental manner in which candidates progressed through appropriately sequenced courses and field experiences in which skills and knowledge built upon candidates' prior knowledge and competence. The team discovered that external changes, such as legislation, impacted the nature of internships and subsequent requirements for acceptance into an intern program. This affected the program so that it is no longer offered in the carefully developed sequence. In an effort to address individual candidate situations, courses have become separate entities on a list, and the rationale for the original design is not evident. The faculty explained they are revisiting the curricular design.

Standard 13: Special Education Field Experiences with Diverse Populations

While many candidates have interactions with a broad spectrum of diverse populations within a single setting or in multiple field experiences, the team did not find evidence that these experiences are tracked. Candidates are not systematically responsible for or exposed to working with a wide variety of disability groups, age groups, or otherwise diverse populations. Student teachers are placed in two distinctly different semester placements while interns do not have requirements for multiple settings.

Standard 21: General Education Field Experiences

The team found evidence that candidates participate in general education courses with colleagues in the multiple subject credential program, and complete one particular assessment assignment with a general education student. The team did not find that there were any supervised general education field experiences, and clearly candidates did not participate in a variety of such experiences. All education specialist candidates must complete a reading assessment with a general education student. However, they are not supervised in the field specifically regarding this assessment.

Institutional Response (2010)

The Institution was required to submit a document that shows how the concerns from the initial visit were addressed. The document stated that changes were made to the field experience requirements of the Education Specialist candidates. Specifically, candidates are now required to participate in a summer placement in a general education setting. A University Supervisor in the summer placement supervises candidates. During the year, candidates are now required to participate in two placements so that they have a variety of experiences.

NDNU also provided the team with a plan that shows how they will transition from the old standards to the new standards for the Education Specialist credentials. The new program will address new standards on autism, universal design, and assistive technology.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

The team reviewed the documents that were provided. The institution indicated that the candidates are in diverse settings, including general education settings. After review of documentation the team finds that all Education Specialist Level 1 program standards are now **Met**.

Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate/Moderate to Severe Level II

Findings on Standards (2009)

One year ago, the team determined one program standard was **Met with Concerns**.

Standard 19: Leadership and Management Skills Met with Concerns

Despite the checklist of skills addressing competence in this standard, there is insufficient evidence to support that candidates have demonstrated leadership skills through participation in school restructuring and reform efforts to impact systems change. Typically, leadership in the area of Moderate/Severe programs includes supporting changes in service delivery models. No evidence was found that candidates are supported either in the field or in coursework with respect to this aspect of the standard.

Institutional Response (2010)

The Institution was required to submit a document that shows how the concern from the initial visit was addressed. The document stated that NDNU has had several meetings with local district personnel to develop the leadership and management skills of candidates within the content of each candidate's school sites. The partnering district or county office of education will provide professional management training and NDNU will provide coursework.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

NDNU provided evidence that the candidates in the credential program are meeting the standard through participating in professional management training and coursework.

After review of documentation the team finds that all Education Specialist Level 2 program standards are now **Met**.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and Internship

Findings on Standards (2009)

One year ago, the team determined four program standards were **Met with Concerns** and one standard (Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership) was **Not Met**.

Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design

The design of the program does not reflect all of the content and requirements of the Standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. The administrative services credential program does not include courses in curriculum and instruction and assessment of student learning. There appears to be a disconnect between some of the candidate projects and the practica.

Standard 2: Program Coordination

There needs to be greater involvement of all partners in the development and the coordination and implementation of the program.

Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership

The program for the Administrative Services credential candidates lacks focus related to instructional leadership and assessment. This content related to curriculum and instruction as well as student assessment is contained in two courses that are required for the master's degree, not for the credential only candidates.

Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences

Candidates lack structured opportunities to perform a wide range of full time administrator responsibilities across a variety of settings and levels.

Standard 9: Assessment

A summative evaluation of candidate competencies, such as those indicated in Commission Standards, is not included in the program.

Institutional Response (2010)

The Master's of Arts in School Administration degree and the Administrative Services Credential program have been combined as one concurrent terminal degree/credential program.

In order to better align the syllabi with the CTC standards on instructional leadership the university took the two Master's courses, Trends in Curriculum and Educational Assessment and Evaluation and added them to the basic requirements for the Administrative Services credential program. These courses address the issues of curriculum, instruction and assessment. The multi-media technology course, Technology Leadership, has been redesigned and renamed Contemporary Topics in Educational Leadership and Technology. The Human Resource Management course (formerly a 3 unit course), was changed to a 2 unit course and re-focused with emphasis on human resource management for educational administrators.

A 1 unit Capstone course has been added to the program during which credential and Master's candidates will demonstrate their command, analysis and synthesis of knowledge and skills at the end of the program. This course will serve as the summary evaluation for candidates in the program.

Practicum courses continue to focus in specific categories, (School/Community Relations, School Law Governance and Politics, Program Initiation and Implementation, and Contemporary Topics in Educational Leadership and Technology). Candidates will vary projects in categorical

courses and work across school sites in a collaborative manner. A comprehensive rubric will be written to score/evaluate practicum projects.

The University collaborates with educational agencies and supervising administrators. Site Administrators work closely with the professors of Practicum courses. The planning and evaluation of the field experience assignments covers an entire semester, and there are four such assignments required, one for each practicum class. The University has a supportive relationship with those supervising administrators who subscribe philosophically to the program.

Faculty has been heavily involved in the re-design of the Administrative Services credential program, alignment of learner outcomes in each course to CTC standards, and in providing input to the Program Director. Full and part time faculty in the program will continue to meet twice each semester to reflect and review changes and recommendations regarding program improvements.

A sub-committee of the Advisory Council worked with the Program Director and faculty to review syllabi, identify issues, and gave input on aspects of the program. This sub-committee also made recommendations for program improvement.

Faculty conduct focus observations of candidates at field sites and will continue to meet with site administrators to discuss what they see as the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates.

A Program Satisfaction survey is being developed to be sent out in October, 2010 to employers of graduates to obtain information about the satisfaction with the work of program graduates.

More formal, standardized measures will be instituted to enhance assessment procedures and practices.

- New designated rubrics will be developed for both written and oral assignments that align with the Core Requirements.
- A revised checklist aligned with the Standards was developed and will be used by supervisors of field experience in the Spring 2010 semester.
- A candidate portfolio will continue to be required for summative assignment in connection with the newly-developed Capstone Course.

Revisit Team Finding (2010)

The team was able to verify that the new Program Director has made extensive use of university, community, candidate, and K-12 resources to assess the current program and plan for program improvement and growth. Interviews with an advisory committee member, with faculty members and students confirmed that a variety of data gathering opportunities (student one-on-one sessions, focus groups, written surveys, faculty and committee meetings, input from Enrollment Management personnel) had been used to involve all partners in program revisions. Team members were made aware that on-going dialogue with district office and site administration is of high priority. Minutes from faculty and advisory committee meetings confirmed that partners were heavily involved with syllabi review/ revision, and the focus of each course in the program. Superintendents and site administrators who were interviewed acknowledged their contribution to the re-focus of the Practicum Projects.

The required four Practicum Projects are jointly agreed upon by the Instructor, Program Director, and candidates Site Supervisor. Projects must be aligned with CTC Standards 3,4, 5, and 6. The Project Director indicated she communicates regularly with the Site Supervisor and the candidate to make sure collaboration is written into the project plan and there is a goal of addressing diversity of school/student experience. The Project Director provided a schedule for team review of visits to candidate's school sites and meetings with the candidate's site administrator. The Program Director indicated that candidates are expected to do two of the four practicum projects is schools with different demographics than the school in which the candidate normally works. There is also an expectation that in order for pre-approval of practicum projects candidates must demonstrate that the project is closely related to the day-to-day work of a full time administrator. The team reviewed a comprehensive rubric which is used to score/evaluated practicum project work.

Several ongoing assessments and evaluations are now in place in the Administrative Services Credential Program. For the Practicum Projects the team was able to review documents used by the Instructor, Project Director and Site Supervisor to accept and approve proposed projects and to ensure they meet standards for the Practicum focus. The team also reviewed a Practicum Project evaluation rubric and an Evaluation of Administrator Effectiveness used at the conclusion of a project by the course instructor, Project Director and Site Supervisor. These assessment instruments aligned closely with CTC standards.

Rubrics were reviewed for written and oral assignments and used in each course. Interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that regular, on going assessments of student competencies are used consistently throughout the program. The Program Director assured the team that an imbedded summative assessment rubric for the Capstone Course will be developed with the assistance of all program faculty. This assessment will be implemented in 2010-2011.

The Program Director and faculty described the use of assessment data, including student interviews, focus groups, Advisory Committee input, and data from course assessment documents to inform program assessment.

The team was able to review revised course syllabi and interview faculty and students about the inclusion of two Master's courses into the Administrative Services Credential program (Trends in Curriculum and Educational Assessment and Evaluation). Syllabi for each of these courses provided evidence that the issue of curriculum and instruction have been effectively infused into the Administrative Services Credential program.

After review of the documentation, interview with faculty, administration, current candidates, and graduates, the team finds that all Administrative Services program standards are now **Met**.